	Case 2:07-cv-00462-MJP Document 16 Filed 10/17/07 Page 1 of 3
01	
02	
03	
04	
05	
06	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
07	AT SEATTLE
08	ROBERT JOSEPH LEON,) CASE NO. C07-0462-MJP
09	Plaintiff,)
10	v. , REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
11	NORM MALENG, et al,
12	Defendants.)
13	
14	On March 28, 2007, plaintiff Robert Leon presented to this Court for filing a civil rights
15	complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 together with an application to proceed with this action in
16	forma pauperis. Plaintiff alleged in his complaint that on August 1, 2000, he was unlawfully
17	detained by the named defendants and by the Seattle Police Department. Plaintiff identified as
18	defendants in his complaint King County Prosecutor Norm Maleng, and King County Deputy
19	Prosecuting Attorneys Ernsdorf, Snow, Tait, and Schindler. Plaintiff sought \$20 million in actual
20	damages and \$100 million in punitive damages for the 62 days he was held in the King County Jail
21	before a VUCSA charge that had been filed against him was dismissed, apparently on speedy trial
22	grounds.
	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION PAGE -1

On April 30, 2007, plaintiff's application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* was granted and his complaint was filed. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 6 and 7.) On the same date, this Court issued an Order directing plaintiff to show cause why his complaint should not be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii) because all of the named defendants appeared to be immune from liability under § 1983. (Dkt. No. 8.) Plaintiff was given thirty days within which to respond to the Order to Show Cause. (*Id.*)

On June 4, 2007, the Clerk of Court received a letter from plaintiff in which plaintiff requested that he be permitted to withdraw his *in forma pauperis* status and that the Federal Public Defender be appointed to represent him in this action. (Dkt. No. 11.) Plaintiff also requested a change of venue to the United States District Court for the District of Oregon. (*Id.*) Plaintiff did not respond in any substantive fashion to this Court's directive that he show cause why this action should not be dismissed pursuant to § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii). Accordingly, on August 2, 2007, this Court issued another Order to Show Cause in which it denied each of the requests contained in plaintiff's June 4, 2007, letter and once again ordered plaintiff to show cause, within thirty days, why this action should not be dismissed pursuant to § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii). (Dkt. No. 13.) Plaintiff was advised that his failure to timely respond to the Second Order to Show Cause would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. (*Id.*)

The Court mailed its August 2, 2007, Second Order to Show Cause to plaintiff at his address of record. However, that mail was returned to the Court on August 14, 2007, with a notation indicating that it was undeliverable because plaintiff was no longer at that address. (Dkt. No. 14.) On August 20, 2007, the Court received a letter from plaintiff in which plaintiff provided a new address. (Dkt. No 15.) On the same date, the Clerk's Office re-mailed this Court's Second

Order to Show Cause to plaintiff at his new address. To date, plaintiff has filed no response to the Court's Second Order to Show Cause.

When a complaint is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief, the Court may dismiss an *in forma pauperis* complaint before service of process under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Plaintiff has been advised that his complaint is subject to dismissal because of his failure to identify any defendant who is not immune from liability under § 1983, and he has been given ample opportunity to demonstrate to the Court that his action should not be dismissed. Plaintiff has made no effort to show cause why his action should not be dismissed. Accordingly, this Court recommends that plaintiff's complaint, and this action, be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii). A proposed order accompanies this Report and Recommendation.

DATED this 17th day of October, 2007.

Mary Alice Theiler

United States Magistrate Judge